

SCANNED

OCT 14 2005

c/o Pro-Se Unit **STAFF ATTORNEY**
OFFICE OF COURT CLERK OF UNITED STATES
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, MARYLAND —
-DISTRICT, ROOM #4415, EDWARD GARMATZ BLDG.
101 WEST LOMBARD STREET, BALTIMORE, MD
21201.

September 9, 2005

Re: CIVIL ACTION No. #

L-97-350 (U.S.)

JONES vs. COICOXAN,
ETAL., FRAUD CLAIM.

DEAR PRO-SE UNIT ATTORNEY:

The Above-referenced civilrights Action,
Filed For \$150.00 dollars Filing Fee, plus
185.00 dollars to execute PLAINTIFF's reply
to the MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT OF
CORRECTIONAL MEDICAL SYSTEMS, INC. (CMS,
INC.), I discovered recently, had been
FRAUDULENTLY dismissed upon incorrect test
STANDARDS OF STATUTES OF LIMITATIONS.

The claim was a discrimination challenge
to MARYLAND STATE'S Felony Murder practice,
POLICY, AND STATUTORY PROCESSES.

Page Two./9/9/05
CA-L-97-350 JONES-VS-CORCORAN
ETAL./ (FRAUD CLAIM)

HOWEVER, IN BIASED DEFERENCE TO
THE SUMMARY JUDGMENT BRIEF'S ASSUMPTION
OF THE STATE OF MARYLAND'S ASSISTANT ATTORNEY
GENERAL, THIS COURT ADOPTED THE CONTENTION
ALSO, ALBEIT ERRONEOUSLY, THAT THE PLAINTIFF
HAD MERELY BEEN CHALLENGING HIS ISOLATED
"JUDGMENT" OF CONVICTION AND SENTENCE, AND
THEREFORE, JUDGE BENSON EVERETTE LEGG, WITH
THE ACQUIESCENCE OF YOUR OFFICE, HAD
DENIED THE 42 U.S.C., SECTION 1983
CHALLENGE WITHOUT ANY HEARING—IMPARTIAL
OR OTHERWISE ADEQUATE—UNDER DUE PROCESS
OF LAW AND EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS.

CONSEQUENTLY, THE JUDGMENT HAS
ADVERSELY IMPACTED MY FIRST ADMENDMENT
RIGHTS TO: FREE SPEECH, FREE CONTRACT,
AND TO PETITION GOVERNMENT FOR REDRESS
OF GRIEVANCES, UNDER DUE PROCESS OF LAW.

Page-Three, 9/9/05, CA-L-97-350.

See The Following Authorities For
The MAJOR premise of This proposition
OF CONSTITUTIONAL LAW:

Cruz-vs- Beto, 405 U.S. 319, AT 321 (1972),

Procunier-vs- MARTINEZ, 416 U.S. 396, 422,
& 428-429 (1974),

Thornhill-vs- ALABAMA, 310 U.S. 88, AT 96-
98 (1940),

Woolley-vs- MAYNARD, 430 U.S. 705, AT 712
(1977),

TIMMERMAN-vs- BROWN, 528 F.2d 811, AT
814-815 (4th Cir. 1975),

Mc CRAY-vs- MARYLAND, 456 F.2d 1, AT 6
4th Cir. 1972),

Edwards-vs- DUNCAN, 355 F.2d 993, AT 995
4th Cir. 1966),

Milliken-vs- BRADLEY, 433 U.S. 267, AT 209
(1977),

Adkins-vs- Children's Hospital of District
of Columbia, 261 U.S. 525, AT 544 (1923),

Ochoa-vs- HERNANDEZ, 230 U.S. 139, AT 154
(1913).

Page-Four. 9/9/05. CA-L-97-350
JONES-VS. COICCOIAN

Moreover, the Supreme Court of United States had recognized explicitly in **HAVENS REALTY CORPORATION-VS- SYLVIA COLEMAN**, 455 U.S. 363, AT 380-381 N.8 (1982) that "A CONTINUING PATTERN, PRACTICE, AND POLICY" OF UNLAWFUL DISCRIMINATION which deprived the respondents of their rights TO ASSOCIATION" is without the reason OF STATUTES OF LIMITATIONS. Id. AT 380 N.8

In **DOWD-VS- UNITED STATES ex REL. COOK**, 340 U.S. 206, AT 209 (1951) the Supreme Court of United States recognize that AN Appellate Court "JUDGMENT" baring A STATE PRISON-INMATE'S ACCESS TO FULL JUDICIAL RELIEF ON APPEAL OF RIGHT, BECAUSE OF STATE GOVERNMENT IMPAIRMENT, WAS AN INADEQUATE, DISCRIMINATORY STATE-REMEDY. Id. AT 209.

SUCH IS THE SITUATION HERE WHERE THE STATE FELONY MURDER CUSTOM IMPAIRS MY FIRST AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT RIGHTS.

Page-Five., 9/9/05., CA-L-97-350

See: IN re Medley, 134 U.S. 160, 169-173
(1890)., Herndon-vs. Sheriff, Lowry, 301
U.S. 242, AT 261-264 (1937)., SKINNER-vs.-
OKLAHOMA ex rel. WILLIAMSON, 316 U.S. 535,
AT 541 (1942) (discriminatory authorized
-statutory deprivation of ASSOCIATION with
OFFspring of state prison recidivist).,
Trop-vs. Dulles, 356 U.S. 86, 100-102 (1958),
KENNEDY-vs. MENDOZA-MARTINEZ, 372 U.S.
144, 159-160, N.10, & 168-169 (1963).,
Woolley-vs. MAYNARD, 430 U.S. 705, 711-712
(1977)., Abbott Laboratories-vs. GARDNER
387 U.S. 136, AT 149-154 (1967).,
18 U.S.C., SECTIONS: 241-242., 1583-1584

For said reasons, I would like
CA-L-350-97, or CA-L-97-350,
JONES-vs. COXCOXAN, et AL. re-opened AND
/or my money immediately reFunded? THANK
you!

Respectfully
MI Nicholas W. Jones.,
ID No. #171785.
Mr. Nicholas W. Jones